



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND ABSTRACTS.

---

**Business Men and Peace.**—Nothing is more striking in the history of peace than the way in which business men have of late come into the arbitration movement. It is not many years since business men sneered at arbitration as the dream of millennium mongers, cranks, faddists, and other people whom practical men are in the habit of steering clear of as long-winded time-wasters.

What is at the bottom of this change? In this city a few days ago an eminent Bostonian, Mr. Wadlin, librarian of the Boston Public Library, made a remark in a speech before the State Board of Trade that often good came out of conflict, and I believe that this change which has come over the business world, this readiness to co-operate in methods which have not hitherto—or, at least, until recently—appealed to business men, is due essentially to business men having been latterly confronted with the fact that diplomacy, clubland, statecraft, parliaments, executives, and other political agents and machinery are no longer alone to be trusted with the destinies of their countries. Twice within a very few years the United States, Great Britain, and France have been so near an armed conflict that the only issue was just to “climb down.” Nothing is more painful for nations than to “climb down” or “cave in,” and nothing is more disastrous sometimes for the future and really more menacing for peace than to have to climb down or cave in. This is not the place to go into particulars about that.

It is my belief that the change which has come over our business world in its attitude toward arbitration is due to the impending conflicts which were avoided; and thus conflict can, in fact, occasionally claim the function of a power for good.

The one instance I refer to was the Venezuela question, in which President Cleveland “put his foot down.” The other case was the Fashoda question, in which the British government “put its foot down.” In both cases an armed conflict would have been the result, if it had not been for the real patriotism of the governments which yielded, and the certainty that the business world of both countries would have disapproved of fighting for unessential things. If there is anything that distinguishes business methods from other methods, whatever they may be, it is that the business man tries in his mind to reduce every question to its just proportions. The business man has what very often is lacking to the politician—the right sense of proportion. Thus it seems naturally monstrous to the business man to employ a sledgehammer for the execution of a fly, but that sort of consideration does not always appeal to those who are not trained in the world of commerce and industry.

No better instance of the way in which business men can do good by putting their foot down was ever seen than when the Association of the Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom took the relations between Great Britain and France into their hands in 1900. At that moment the hostile feeling between the two countries, so far as the press appeared to echo it, was so strong that on the slightest provocation the guns would have gone off, by themselves.

At the danger of being charged with egotism, I must refer here to my own agency in the change of feeling which began at that time. I had the privilege of being at that moment chairman of the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris, and in that capacity was able to take a public attitude toward the subject of Anglo-French relations which I could not otherwise have assumed. I believe that my appeal to the French nation at that time had the effect—at least, it is credited with having had that effect—of bringing to an end a perfect epidemic of caricatures of our late great queen. I believe that the assistance which was given to me by Mr. W. L. Courtney, the editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, in that great

periodical, at the same period was the beginning of a more reasonable attitude in Great Britain toward France, and that my article in the *Fortnightly* to some extent influenced the Association of the Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom in accepting my proposal to entertain them, as president of the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris, if they would come over and hold their autumn meeting there, and show the French that the British nation—a nation of shopkeepers, and we are not ashamed of it—entertained none of those antipathetic feelings toward the French with which a too bellicose press seemed to credit the British nation. I pointed out the danger of doing nothing, of standing by and letting a small minority drag the two nations into a conflict. In spite of warnings, dissuasion, and poohpoohings by the stormbirds of Pall Mall and Fleet Street, I got a unanimous response, and the meeting that was held in the autumn of the same year was the largest meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce ever held, and the reception given by the French to them showed that they appreciated the full force and importance of this unwonted and spontaneous action of the representatives of the business world of the United Kingdom. Every French minister of state, even the president of the republic himself, gave me practically *carte blanche* to draw up the scheme of their entertainment, and those who came over from Great Britain—there were 800 of them—went home to tell their fellow-citizens in every part of the kingdom that the French and the British peoples meant to be friends, and that, so far as seeing any manifestations of hostility toward them in France, they had received nothing but the warmest and kindest expressions of sympathy, in spite of the Boer war then raging, about which every English newspaper was daily culling irritating comments by the French press.

That was how the business men of Great Britain started the movement which has since been so successful. When six months later I proposed a treaty of arbitration to stimulate and consolidate the better feeling, I knew the response I should get from the business men of both countries. It is one of the most extraordinary features of the Anglo-French movement that the London press was not aware of the real situation, whereas the English provincial press, better informed by the delegates who had come to Paris to the great meeting I have referred to, knew first-hand better. Hence it is that this movement from start to finish has been enthusiastically backed by the English provincial press and by the Paris press, the French provincial press, like the London press, having been less well informed.

To tell the history of the Anglo-French arbitration movement is another story, which I may be able to tell some other time. All that space allows here is to say why and how business men in Great Britain are taking such a direct and practical interest in a movement which was so recently thought to belong to the field of philosophical speculation and dreamy idealism. I have explained why; and now I will say a few words about how.

All the chambers of commerce of the United Kingdom have now pledged themselves to arbitration. All the chambers of commerce of France have done the same. These chambers of commerce have not only pledged themselves, they have used their necessarily practical influence in enlisting in this cause municipal counsels and trade unions, thus bringing into the movement employers and employed, capital and labor, and above all, the moving political forces which produce a more direct influence on the opinion of a nation's representatives in parliament. This combined influence in both countries was so overwhelming that the British and French governments could not for one moment hesitate to take action when the time came. They took action in direct response to the work I have described. This was done on May 11, after a question had been put in the House of Commons by my friend, Mr. Ernest Beckett, which elicited so friendly a response from the prime minister that the following day the French ambassador called on Lord Lansdowne and asked him if he was prepared to enter into negotiations.

That question was as follows: "Has the prime minister given consideration to the numerous resolutions which have been passed by the chambers of com-

merce in favor of a treaty of arbitration and conciliation between Great Britain and France?" Mr. Balfour replied that he had noted with much interest and sympathy these resolutions.

It is thus seen that it was the direct action of chambers of commerce which brought the two governments into contact, and thereby was done what the peace conference was unable to do; what the czar, with all his influence, fell short of doing; what enthusiasts and idealists (God bless them!) have been trying to do for a hundred years or more; and what might never have been done at all had not the practical business men of the two countries insisted upon doing it. That is what business men can do when they put their shoulders to the wheel, and I have shown how they can do it.

And now I hope the business men of the United States will join the business men of the United Kingdom and carry through a treaty between these two countries in the same way as the British and French business men did between their two countries. I believe—nay, I know—the Senate of the United States would be only too glad to feel that it had a warrant for giving priority on its already overcrowded business list to take up this subject as an urgent one. It is an urgent one. When two nations seem inclined to put their friendship into the form of a treaty, that is a subject which has priority over every other, because it involves the welfare for years to come of nations, which must pass before communities and individuals.

Moreover, I believe that such a treaty between Great Britain and the United States would have an effect on the future of mankind which no treaty between any other two civilized powers could ever aspire to produce. Yet the next treaty is likely to be between Great Britain and Italy—in fact, I can say that it is practically settled at this moment. Why should our two go-ahead Anglo-Saxon nations leave it to others to show the way? Why should we not, in one great overwhelming wave of public opinion, bring the matter to a head between these two nations, and with, not 200 or 300 resolutions, but with 2,000 or 3,000 resolutions, show the Senate that it is warranted in dealing with the matter forthwith?

I am not quite sure that the business men of the United States are conscious of the immense power they can wield in the destinies of the world. They are doing already an immense amount of good work for this country; but I think that if they step into the arena of competition for the consolidation, once and for all, of the peace of the world, they will do the work begun on the other side of the Atlantic with all the magnificent speed and effectiveness with which they do everything they undertake on this side.—THOMAS BARCLAY, "Business Men and Peace. A New Force for International Arbitration," in *Boston Transcript*, December 19, 1903.

**Ethics, a Science.**—The fundamental distinction between a science and an art is the distinction between knowing and doing. Art always connotes facile, correct performance. Where both a science and an art deal with a given range of phenomena, there is danger of confusion between them. Thus there is both a science and an art which is concerned with laws, with music, with architecture, with conduct. Thus at the start it is important to draw a sharp distinction between the science of ethics and the art of morality, or the practice of right conduct.

Another question arises: Is ethics a descriptive science, or merely a normative science, as most writers on the subject have held? Ethics, like hygiene and jurisprudence, is normative in the sense that it is a science which deals descriptively with norms. As a science it is not imperative, but indicative, a statement of "the way things are." Of course, those items of a science which appeal to human desire and will get transferred into imperatives readily; but in so far as the normative science itself lapses into the imperative mood, it ceases to be a science. Ethics then merely says: "There are various ways of behaving observable among men, and others conceivable. These various ways have these respective characteristics and consequences."

Although ethics, in common with all science, is theoretical, it is nevertheless intensely practical in the sense that it forms the basis for the practice of morality. Thus it has great practical value in that it shows the results of various types of moral conduct; for example, of unenlightened benevolence or of a pharisaic attitude toward the fallen; for not all types of morality are equally conducive to human welfare. Thus ethics furnishes a scientific criticism of morality. Its positive work in moral reconstruction consists in the sometimes slow, sometimes rapid, emergence of new and better ideals suggested by study of actual moral conditions. Knowledge of human nature and human conditions, and calm, sober, collected judgment on life based on moral experience, is absolutely an essential. Finally ethics is an empirical science dealing inductively with the same order of data as the other special sciences are called upon to describe, organize, and explain.—PROFESSOR E. B. MCGILVARY, in *Philosophical Review*, November, 1903.

E. B. W.

**Farm Colonies of the Salvation Army.**—The first of these in the United States was organized in 1898 at Fort Amity, Colo. Two others at Fort Ronné, Calif., and Fort Herrick, Ohio, have since been established. The motive for this movement has been to relieve city congestion and prevent families from being broken up at critical times. "Place the waste labor on the waste land by means of the waste capital, and thereby convert the trinity of waste into a unity of production;" or, in other words, "the landless man to the manless land."

The plan adopted is to colonize only married men with their families, and only such as by their habits give promise of success. Business methods are employed throughout the process. Necessary funds have been raised by issuing \$150,000 thirty-year bonds on the California and Colorado colonies. In addition to the general improvements provided, it costs on an average \$500 to install a family in the colony and furnish it with the necessary tools, implements, and live-stock. Five years' experience has shown that the colonists are eager to pay off this indebtedness at the earliest possible moment. The sense of ownership is cultivated from the first, with excellent results. The experience of the Salvation Army is adverse to community of ownership as resulting "in the lazy doing nothing and expecting everything, while the industrious do everything and get nothing."

The farm colonies of the Salvation Army were organized to prove the possibility of relieving the congestion of the great cities, by removing worthy but poor families, furnishing them with the necessary capital, and settling them as home owners upon the land. It was argued by those who, while friendly to the scheme, doubted its practicability, that (1) they would not go, (2) they would not stay, (3) they would not work, and (4) they would not pay. Patient experiment has served to prove that these objections were groundless. The worthy poor of the great cities have gone, have stayed, have worked, and have paid. As a result of their successful toil they have become home owners, and the percentage of failures has been much smaller than was anticipated.—COMMANDER BOOTH TUCKER, in *U. S. Bulletin of Labor*, September, 1903.

E. B. W.

**Three Stages of Individual Development.**—The monocellular animal, undifferentiated and without organization, is the lowest type of individual. Successively higher types are revealed as the individual becomes first an organized system, then a centrally controlled system, that is, a self-conscious volitional being, and in the third place a being conscious of an implicit unity with other individuals. These three stages are characteristic, not only of men considered singly, but in social groups as well. There is first the racial life, with its customs and blood-unity, followed by the stage of individualism, and then the swing of the pendulum through a period of reconstruction between the individual and society.

In the Hebrew race we see the strong national life under the early kings, the emergence of individualism under Jeremiah, and of reorganization under Ezekiel

and Ezra. In Greece the first two stages only were reached, and then disintegrating strife sent to destruction the most brilliant and most gifted of the ancient races. In modern times a Rousseau followed on the heels of a Hobbes and ushered in the age of revolutions. The reconstruction between the sense of individual sovereignty and the demands of the larger social world is even now being effected.

The same trinity of stages is evident in the relation of the individual to organized religion. Passing over the cases of India and Israel, we may see the first stage in the intense institutionalism of the pre-Reformation period. After the reaction which followed, and in some measure continues, we find ourselves again facing the problem of reorganization. And its solution is to be found in the fact that the individual cannot be himself apart from this larger life, from which, in the period of alienation and estrangement, he has separated himself. On this basis the church is seen to be, not an institution which already exists without the individual, to which he simply gives allegiance. It is simply the religious life which he has in common with others expressed in an organized form. —REV. J. D. STOOPS, in *International Journal of Ethics*, October, 1903.

E. B. W.

**The Sociological Concept of Liberty.**—The most enlightened of our age are still haunted, without being conscious of it, by the religious and metaphysical specters of other days. The idea of free-will, reappearing under the form of the vague notion of liberty, is bowed down to by all, but defined by none. In what does liberty consist? A free act is an act of coercive force, of power, exercised despotically by individuals or groups upon external nature or upon men. Liberty and despotism are sister and brother, often enemies it is true, yet so much alike as frequently to be mistaken the one for the other. The origin of both is found in the kind of social thought, of psychological interaction, which is present. Liberty is knowledge entered upon a further phase, an active phase of evolution. Despotism, on the other hand, is a degree of knowledge so inferior that we term it ignorance. But it does not seem an unjust yoke, oppressive and intolerable, except to those who possess a knowledge more extended and more profound; that it to say, to those who retain a force, a superorganic power more great. But when revolt occurs, the liberator of today becomes the despot of tomorrow, for the men of tomorrow will have increased in knowledge. Knowledge and liberty are thus the obverse and the reverse of one and the same social fact. Knowledge—and all that has been said applies to philosophy and art as well—is an accumulated and latent liberty, and liberty is a science, a philosophy, an æsthetics become active and putting forth external effort. Tolerant, neutral, *laissez-faire* contemporaries have no right to fashion and model a metaphysical concept of absolute liberty upon the temporary and exceptional situation in which social knowledge and its technical applications find themselves today. For such a dogma will certainly have to be abandoned when sociology has made an important advance.—EUGENE DE ROBERTY, "Le concept sociologique de liberté," in *Revue philosophique*, November, 1903.

E. B. W.

**Negro Education in the South.**—In spite of forty years of freedom, the negro who loves so well to "travel on the cars" is still in the South, and is there from choice. The South is both debtor and creditor to the negro; debtor for the surpassing loyalty so strongly shown in the dark days of the Civil War, and creditor by virtue of the fact that the South in a century and a half enabled the negro to make more progress from savagery to civilization than any free barbarous people ever achieved in so short a time. Slavery was the first chapter in the history of negro education.

The second chapter is a record of reconstruction blunders committed upon the theory that what the negro needed, and practically all that he needed, was the education of books. The results were at once disappointing and grotesque. The problem has now been largely remanded to the justice and even the tenderness of the South itself. The South has repudiated and will repudiate the suggestion

to limit the funds for negro education to the taxes raised from that race, but the policy of separate schools will, of course, be maintained, as coeducation of the races, as the most intelligent negroes are coming to admit, would militate against the best interests of both races.

The third stage which negro education is reaching, under the wise leadership of Booker Washington, is an adaptation to industrial and agricultural needs. Eighty-five per cent. of those engaged in gainful occupations in the South are tillers of the soil, and while training in "the three R's" is essential, education must be made strongly tributary to interest and efficiency in agriculture.—DR. WALTER B. HILL, in *Annals of the American Academy*, September, 1903.

E. B. W.

**Assistance for the Aged, Infirm, and Incurable.**—In the course of the last session there passed the Chamber of Deputies an important bill relative to compulsory assistance for the aged, the infirm, and the incurable. The principle of the right to this assistance is laid down in the following words: "All Frenchmen without resources, who are seventy years of age and infirm, or afflicted with an incurable disease which renders them incapable of self-support, have the right, under the conditions and reservations below, of the public responsibility for support which is instituted under the form of compulsory assistance according to the present law." This assistance is given by the commune in its own institution for the purpose, or, in the absence of such an institution, by the department, or in the last resort by the state. The bureau of charities of each commune prepares every year a list of those claiming public assistance, and sends it to the municipal council, with which rests the decision. An appeal may, however, be made to a special commission and from it to the minister of the interior, who, with a central commission of public aid, constitutes a final determining body. The assistance offered varies from the payment of a certain sum monthly to persons in their own homes, to admission to a public hospital, or, with the consent of the persons concerned, to a private hospital or the home of a private individual. The expense is proportioned between the commune, the department, and the nation, according to a method outlined in the law.—*Bulletin de l'Office du Travail*, October, 1903.

E. B. W.

**Education not the Cause of Race Decline.**—*Résumé*: "The data now available indicate that the highly educated male element does more toward reproducing itself than any other large group of our native population. The marriage rate is the same, and the number of the surviving children to the family is greater than it is for the native population at large, so that we can no longer accuse the college graduate, or, if I may say, 'the highly educated male portion of our population,' of having an exceptionally small family, and of doing less than any other groups toward reproducing the population; nor must we lay the blame for the low fecundity of the native American family on higher education. Shortening the term of college study will effect no change. Wealth, luxury, and social ambition are cause of the diminishing size of the family and of race-decline. . . . The assumption of a false social position, the struggle for the attainment of luxury more than its possession, leads to the limitation of the family, by 'the increased amount of restraint exercised,' as one author delicately expresses it, but, to speak without circumlocution, by often ruinous measures for the prevention of conception, and by criminal means for the destruction of the product of such conception if it does accidentally occur. Such, in plain words, are the causes which lead to the small size of the American family of all classes."—GEORGE J. ENGLEMAN, in *Popular Science Monthly*, June, 1903.

T. J. R.